

42

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/665,882		RINERSON ET AL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	George C. Eckert II		2815	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George C. Eckert II. (3) _____

(2) Morgan Malino. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 March 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Buckley.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


GEORGE ECKERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Malino provided a proposed amendment which cites that the multi-resistive state element remains substantially crystalline while its resistance is modified. Buckley appears to teach a phase-change memory element and thus would not anticipate the amended claim. Further consideration in view of Buckley, the art of record and additional art as needed is required before determination of patentability is made. Mr. Molino will submit the amendment as to crystallinity, which will be considered in due course.